

Remarks

The non-final Office Action dated June 10, 2009, indicated the following new grounds of rejection: claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kuramoto *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0132885); claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '885 reference in view of Kadambi *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0140612); claims 5, 11, 14 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '885 reference in view of Koskiniemi *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0098813); claims 15, 17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '885 reference in view of Carlson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,641); claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '885 and '641 references and further in view of the '813 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses each of these objections and rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejections because the cited '885 reference either alone or in combination with the various other cited references lacks correspondence. For example, none of the asserted references teaches the claimed invention "as a whole" (§ 103(a)) including aspects regarding, *e.g.*, a self supporting member having at least one feed pillar and a shorting pillar. Because none of the cited references teaches these aspects, no reasonable interpretation of the asserted prior art, taken alone or in combination, can provide correspondence to the claimed invention. As such, the § 103(a) rejections fail.

More specifically, the '885 reference does not teach that vertical element 3 (*i.e.*, the alleged feed pillar) and conductors 7 (*i.e.*, the alleged shorting pillar) are part of a single self supporting member that connects an RF circuit to an antenna, as claimed. Instead, the '885 reference teaches that the vertical element 3 and the conductors 7 are separate supporting structures of antenna 1 as is clearly shown in Figures 1A and 1B. In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 to improve readability by separating limitations directed to the self supporting member including at least one feed pillar and a shorting pillar. The '885 reference does not correspond to the claimed self supporting member because the vertical element 3 and the conductors 7 are separate supporting elements.

Moreover, the '885 reference does not teach a self supporting member having an antenna interface connected to an antenna by a pressure connection, as in the claimed invention. The '885 reference does not make any mention of a pressure connection that connects a self supporting member to an antenna and the '885 reference does not teach that dielectric plate 2 (*i.e.*, the asserted antenna interface) is connected to conductor 80 (*i.e.*, the asserted antenna) via a pressure connection. *See, e.g.*, Figure 18A and paragraphs 0099-0102.

In view of the above, the '885 reference does not correspond to numerous aspects of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejections are improper and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9068 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.410PA)